UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | . FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/798,677 | 03/11/2004 | John Michael Green II | 29997/068 | 6318 |
| | 7590 12/13/200 I & FRANK LLP | 7 | EXAMINER | |
| 311 S. WACKER DRIVE | | | CHAO, ELMER M | |
| | SUITE 2500 CHICAGO, IL 60606 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3737 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 12/13/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| <i>▶</i> • | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| • | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| Interview Summary | 10/798,677 | GREEN ET AL. | | | | |
| merview dummary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Elmer Chao | 3737 | | | | |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): | | | | | | |
| (1) Elmer Chao. | (3) | | | | | |
| (2) <u>Thomas Riley</u> . | (4) | | | | | |
| Date of Interview: 26 November 2007. | | | | | | |
| Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative] | | | | | | |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) discussed: 1. | | | | | | |
| Identification of prior art discussed: Sechtman et al. (U.S. 6,390,982). | | | | | | |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. | | | | | | |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative argued that the functional limitations were not taught by the reference. Examiner asserted that the elements of the system in the reference are capable of performing the functional limitations. Applicants' representative and Examiner also discussed additional ways to overcome the reference(s). (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) | | | | | | |
| THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. | | | | | | |
| 000 | | | | | | |

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required